

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action, the specification, abstract, and title of the invention are objected to for certain informalities.

Claims 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,982,629 to *Shoji et al.* ("*Shoji*").

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended the specification, abstract, and title of the invention to address the informalities listed in the Office Action. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 6, and 8-10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 4, 5 and 7 are presently pending.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants have amended claim 5 in order to expedite the prosecution of this case. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 5 do not narrow the intended scope of the claim, and therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 meets all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as amended. Thus, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 4, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Shoji*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Shoji* does not anticipate each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention and that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn. Newly amended independent claim 4 recites, in part, "a step of forming a terminal portion in manufacturing said circuit board, said step of forming a terminal portion being to stack a base layer of copper and a plated layer of gold successively to form the terminal portion, wherein the circuit board is a square-shaped rigid-type printed wiring board made of glass epoxy resin." *Shoji* fails to disclose at least these features of newly amended independent claim 4.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because *Shoji* does not disclose, teach, or suggest each feature of newly amended independent claim 4.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5 and 7 are also allowable insofar as they recite the patentable combinations of features recited in claim 4, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied prior art.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: 

David E. Connor  
Reg. No. 59,868

Dated: April 13, 2007

Customer No.: 009629

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-739-7000

Facsimile: 202-739-3001